

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

<b>LITEPANELS, LLC and LITEPANELS, INC.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiffs</b>	§	
	§	
<b>vs.</b>	§	<b>CASE NO. 2:06-CV-167</b>
	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
<b>GEKKO TECHNOLOGY, LTD.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Defendant</b>	§	
	§	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant Gekko Technology, Ltd.'s ("Gekko") Motion to Reconsider its Motion to Dismiss (Docket No. 19). For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** the motion.

Plaintiffs Litepanels, LLC and Litepanels, Inc. ("Litepanels") filed their First Amended Complaint on April 21, 2006 alleging that Gekko violated U.S. Patent Nos. 6,749,310 ("the '310 patent") and 6,948,823 ("the '823 patent"). These patents relate to wide area lighting effects systems, and the alleged infringing products are lighting systems used in film and video. Gekko filed a motion to dismiss on July 13, 2006 asserting several grounds. The Court denied the motion. Gekko now files this motion to reconsider the motion to dismiss.

A motion to reconsider allows a party to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence. *Tex. Instruments, Inc., v. Hyundai Elecs. Indus., Co.*, 50 F. Supp. 2d 619, 621 (E.D. Tex. 1999) (Heartfield, J.). Motions to reconsider should not be used to re-urge matters a party has already advanced. *Id.* Gekko's motion does not assert any new grounds for lack of jurisdiction. The Court has already dealt with the arguments set forth by Gekko and has denied its motion to dismiss. Accordingly, Gekko's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 20th day of November, 2006.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Leonard Davis', written over a horizontal line.

**LEONARD DAVIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**